

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 4-21 are now pending in the application. By this Paper, claims 1-3 and 5-15 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled and new claims 16-21 have been added. The basis for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification and respectfully submit that the objections have been overcome.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 5, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully submit that the § 112 rejections have been overcome. With respect to claim 15, Applicants have made amendments to clarify that the method is directed to making a device for wetting objects. Applicants have added new claim 18 directed to a

method of wetting objects with a device including a platform according to claim 1. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

VOLUNTARY CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants have made various voluntary claim amendments. In this regard, the language of claim 2 specifically directed to silicone has been moved to new claim 16. The language of claim 12 specifically directed to a “membrane” has been moved to new claim 17. Other minor changes have been made to the claims for readability.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner states that claims 4-6, 11, 12, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-3 and 5-19 ultimately dependent therefrom are in a condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Armstrong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,228,635). Applicants respectfully submit that the § 102(b) rejections are now moot in view of the amendments to claim 1 accepting the allowable subject matter.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new claims 20 and 21. Independent claim 20 recites that the at least one spacer defining a space between the base and the object support. Dependent claim 21 recites that the bearing device sealably closes the space between the base plate and the object support. Armstrong et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one spacer defining a space between a base and an object support. The remaining art of record is similarly deficient. Furthermore, the invention defined by claim 20 would not have been obvious in view of the collective art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 and claim 21 dependent therefrom are in a condition for allowance.

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The undersigned attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the brief telephone discussions of 4 January 2011. During the call, the Examiner agreed to conduct a telephonic interview after receipt of this Responsive Amendment in the event she does not consider the case to be in a condition for allowance. The undersigned attorney believes any remaining issues should be readily resolvable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4 January 2011

By: /Stephen T. OLSON/
Stephen T. Olson, Reg. No. 36,626
Attorney for Applicants

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

STO/kgg

15786477.1